



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

SW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/828,997	04/09/2001	Zion Azar	127/02185	1331
7590	12/10/2004		EXAMINER	
WILLIAM H. DIPPERT REED SMITH LLP 599 LEXINGTON AVENUE 29TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022			ROLLINS, ROSILAND STACIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3739	
			DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/828,997	AZAR, ZION
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rosiland S Rollins	3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 September 2004.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 3-7,10,14,15,23,24 and 29-42 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 3-7,10,14,15,23,24, 41, 42 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 29-40 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 29-40 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer back to a preceding claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims not been further treated on the merits.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 3, 4, 10, 14, 15, 41, 42/4, 24, 42/10, 42/14 and 42/24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chen et al. (US 5814008). Chen et al. disclose an apparatus for heating of a target comprising a first source of energy (26) and a second source of energy (28) adapted to selectively heat the target to a second higher temperature (col. 5 lines 53-67). **Regarding claim 10** see column 5 lines 11-13. **Regarding claims 14, 15, 42/14** see column 5 lines 15-25.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5, 6, 42/5, 42/6, 7 and 42/7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. Chen et al. teach all of the limitations of the claims except the specific temperature ranges as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to operate the Chen et al. apparatus at the temperature ranges claimed, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentations.

Claims 23 and 42/23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. '008 further in view of Tankovich (US 5425728). Chen et al. teach all of the limitations of the claims except removing hair. Tankovich teaches that it is old and well known in the art to use PDT for hair removal. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the Chen et al. process for hair removal, particularly in view of the teaching of Tankovich that such is old and well known in the art.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/10/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding the argument that there is no significant temperature increase of the target area; see col. 2 lines 6-21 and col. 5 lines 53-68. Regarding the argument that Chen does not teach pulsed electromagnetic energy or heating by a filtered broadband electromagnetic source, in col. 5 lines 10+ Chen discloses the general types of electromagnetic energy and heating that can be used which inherently include those claimed. Regarding the argument that Chen et al. does not teach dermatological

treatment since Chen et al. is directed towards treating cancer, treating skin cancer would be a form of dermatological treatment, which is met by Chen et al.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rosiland S Rollins whose telephone number is (571) 272-4772. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri. 9:00 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda C. Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
Rosiland S Rollins  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3739

RR